

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

WILLIAM TERRYBERRY,

Plaintiff,

vs.

LIBERTY MUTUAL FIRE INSURANCE
COMPANY; DOES I through XX, inclusive;
and/or ROE CORPORATIONS I through XX,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:13-cv-00658-GMN-CWH

ORDER

Pending before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Carl W. Hoffman, (ECF No. 80), which recommends that Plaintiff William Terryberry's Motion for Re-taxation of Costs (ECF No. 74) be **DENIED** and Defendant Liberty Mutual Fire Insurance Company's Motion for Re-Taxation of Costs (ECF No. 75) be **GRANTED in part** and **DENIED in part**.

A party may file specific written objections to the findings and recommendations of a United States Magistrate Judge made pursuant to Local Rule IB 1–4. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B); D. Nev. R. IB 3–2. Upon the filing of such objections, the Court must make a de novo determination of those portions to which objections are made. *Id.* The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); D. Nev. IB 3–2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, the Court is not required to conduct “any review at all ... of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a district court is not required to review a magistrate judge's report and recommendation where no objections have been filed. *See, e.g., United States v. Reyna–Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1122

1 (9th Cir. 2003).

2 Here, no objections were filed, and the deadline to do so has passed.

3 Accordingly,

4 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 80) is
5 **ACCEPTED and ADOPTED** to the extent that it is not inconsistent with this Order.


6 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff William Terryberry's Motion for Re-
7 taxation of Costs (ECF No. 74) is **DENIED**.

8 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendant Liberty Mutual Fire Insurance
9 Company's Motion for Re-Taxation of Costs (ECF No. 75) is **GRANTED in part** and
10 **DENIED in part**.

11 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendant's costs be retaxed at \$4,195.37.

12 **DATED** this 23rd day of September, 2015.

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25



Gloria M. Navarro, Chief Judge
United States District Judge